



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/040,567	01/07/2002	Yong-Jun Cho	SO-414	2301

7590 06/10/2004  
Bidyut K. Niyogi  
Transnational Enterprises, Inc.  
78 Cypress St  
Millburn, NJ 07041

EXAMINER

MARSH, STEVEN M

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3632

DATE MAILED: 06/10/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/040,567

Applicant(s)

CHO ET AL.

Examiner

Steven M Marsh

Art Unit

3632

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 October 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 8-11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 8-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

### DETAILED ACTION

This is the second office action for U.S. Application 10/040,567 for a Semi Sandwich Panel filed by Yong-Jun Cho on January 7, 2002. Claims 1-7 have been canceled.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 8-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. In the independent claim 8, Applicant claims, "surface finishing materials folded with each other". However, there is no indication in the specification or drawings of the surface finishing materials being folded with each other. The claim is being interpreted without the limitation of the surface finishing materials being folded with each other. Also, Applicant claims that the core is formed by the impregnation of a honeycomb into phenol or epoxy resin. However, the specification gives no indication that the honeycomb core is impregnated into anything. The claim is being interpreted without the limitation of a core consisting of honeycomb impregnated into phenol or epoxy resin.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 8-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. There are numerous grammatical errors contained in claims 8-11. For example, line 4 of claim 8 reads, "a core material into a predetermined position". Line 6 of claim 8 reads, "formed by impregnation one of an aluminum honeycomb". Claims 10 and 11 read, "wherein the predetermined position is of the surface finishing materials and/or portions of the edge". Due to the unclear nature of the language used in claims 8-11, the claims have been examined to the best extent possible.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

Claims 8-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Higgins in view of Wilson. Higgins discloses a semi sandwich panel with surface finishing materials (36 and 38) of a predetermined thickness and size, which are made of carbon fiber (see col. 4, lines 1-3). There is a core material (34) in a predetermined position between the surface finishing materials, with a predetermined volume protruding from one side of the surface finishing materials. The core material has an insert fastener (10) for receiving a bolt (44) externally connected to the fastener. Higgins does not specifically disclose an insert nut, however, it does disclose an insert

Art Unit: 3632

fastener. Nuts are a known form of fastener for receiving bolts, and it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the present invention to have used a nut as the fastener taught by Higgins because nuts are a well-known form of fastener in the art.

Higgins does not specifically disclose a paper honeycomb core. Wilson discloses a panel with a paper honeycomb core (12) disposed between two surface finishing materials (11 and 14). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the present invention to have used a paper honeycomb core for the honeycomb core taught by Higgins, as taught by Wilson, for the purpose lightweight material for the core.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed 16 October 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., the size of the honeycomb material within the surface finishing material and the method for forming the insert fastener) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from

the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

### **Conclusion**

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Steven Marsh whose telephone number is (703) 305-0098. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:00AM to 4:30 PM. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone

Application/Control Number: 10/040,567

Page 6

Art Unit: 3632

number is (703) 308-2168. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.



Steven M. Marsh

June 3, 2004



LESLIE A. BRAUN  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER